

# **GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**

## **Community Impact Mitigation and Workforce Development Work Group**

### **Summary of November 3, 2005 Meeting Report to Integrating Work Group Regarding Work Group's November 2, 2005 Meeting**

Mark Pisano, SCAG – Co-chair  
Lynn Terry, ARB – (temporary Co-chair reporting)

The Work Group met on November 2, 2005 in Sacramento. In addition, ARB staff received public comment at its November 1, 2005 meeting in Oakland that addressed community mitigation as well as the ARB emission reduction plan currently under development.

Community comments received at the Oakland meeting were focused on four general topics:

- It should be the role of the community, not government agencies, to identify the community impacts of concern.
- Health impacts should be assessed and reduced at a community level, not just at regional or statewide levels. Cumulative impacts should be considered.
- Land use decisions are critical – appropriate separations between incompatible land uses are needed.
- Trucks need to be kept out of neighborhoods.

Highlights of comments made at November 2, 2005 workgroup meeting:

#### Community Mitigation

Buffers were identified as desirable by both community members and others. Communities support open space, waterfront access, and other land uses that contribute to quality of life. A universal approach to the issue in terms of process, tools, and resources would be valuable. Due to the opportunity costs of preserving land near ports (e.g., foregone local tax revenues) there is strong pressure to allow new residences and other development.

Community impacts of concern identified were: emissions, noise, traffic congestion, and that a cumulative analysis of all impacts is needed. There was a comment about lack of responsiveness by local decision-makers to community concerns. Also, that mitigation should be flexible since the unforeseen can occur.

Comments were made that ARB should have a greater role in land use decisions; the longstanding authority of local government was recognized.

There were multiple comments on the importance of accelerating introduction of new technologies. There was also recognition that anticipation of future technology should not justify bad land use decisions today. Good planning could reduce mitigation needs.

There was discussion about the potential for improving planning processes, including CEQA, through performance standards and comprehensive planning with a strong land use component.

CEC staff commented that energy aspects should be considered.

Key comments on mitigation were : substantial funds are needed, the existing problem must be mitigated, new impacts should be mitigated concurrently, the most impacted areas should be the highest priority, and participation in the global economy should not come at the expense of public health in the community.

#### Workforce Development

Key comments by educators, industry: A challenge on the educational front is the tradition of on the job training. Recruitment can be difficult since supply chain logistics is not widely seen as a career opportunity. There is a potential career ladder that needs to be promoted to improve the perception of the industry. Training in the community will help. There are challenges to job placement for those without experience; apprenticeships could help. The state needs to invest in education. The location of entry level jobs may not be in the most impacted communities so relocation could be involved.

Community members suggested that training in the community is needed – not at remote campuses. Space for community based training can be found in communities – churches and warehouses are possibilities. The communities want clean, green, safe jobs. Training in the community must be comprehensive and effective with job placement.